

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,619	12/17/2003	Liebrecht Venter	40280-198096	4070
26694	7590 07/07/2004		EXAM	IINER
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP P.O. BOX 34385			DEB, ANJAN K	
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2858	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4)	Interview Summary (PTO-413)
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Attachment(s)

Art Unit: 2858

Application/Control Number: 10/736,619

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Objections

1. Claims 5,6,15,16,23,24,33,34 are objected to because of the following informalities: "exclusive or" should be changed to --exclusive OR--. Appropriate correction is required.

#### **Double Patenting**

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,703,847 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are broader in scope and encompass all of the claimed limitations recited in U.S. Patent No. 6,703,847.

Art Unit: 2858

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Anjan K. Deb whose telephone number is 571-272-2228. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, N. Le, can be reached at (571) 272-2233.

Anjan K. Deb

Tel: 571-272-2228

Patent Examiner

Fax: 571-273-2228

Art Unit: 2858

E-mail: anjan.deb@uspto.gov

6/15/04